5th February 1936]

(*d*) the normal amount of period in dealing with such applications and the maximum delay and minimum delay in the last three years?

A.—The Government have no information and do not consider the subject to be of sufficient importance to justify the time involved in obtaining the information asked for.

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" My only idea in sending up this question is not to get the figures for any fancy purposes but to point out to the Government the delay . . ."

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Order, order; the hon. Member has to put only the supplementary question; I have been observing that the hon. Member is invariably making a speech every time."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—" I was premising my interpellation. May I ask the Hon. Minister to see that the matter is expedited so that there will not be any delay?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I shall consider if any further steps are required for expediting these applications."

Amount of grant allotted under Elementary Education during the years 1934–35 *and* 1935–36.

* 734 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount of Elementary Education grant allotted to each district during the years 1934–35 and 1935–36;

(*b*) the amount of Elementary Education grant which has remained unspent in each district during the period; and

(*c*) how the allotment to each district is made by the department and what the principles followed are when the grant is allotted to each district?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) It is presumed that the reference is to the teaching grant allotment. The particulars relating to the year 1934–35 are given in the appended statement.[a] Similar figures for the year 1935–36 are not yet ready.

(*c*) Figures relating to the assessed grant for each district are supplied by the District Educational Officer in the case of boys' schools and the Inspectress of Girls' Schools in the case of girls' schools and the available budget provision is distributed with reference to these figures in the same proportion to all District Educational Councils.

Representations for the reduction of tuition fees in the Law College, Madras.

* 735 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any representations have been received for reducing the rate of tuition fees in the Law College at Madras; and

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 620 infra.

[5th February 1936

(b) if so, from whom and what action has been or is proposed to be taken thereon?

A.—No such representations have been received.

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder:—" May I ask whether the Government are proposing to examine the question of reducing the tutorial fees in view of the fact that there is a surplus of income every year?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" If it is the hon. Member's idea that the tuition fees must be reduced, I must say that I am opposed to that."

Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar:—" Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to give us a statement showing the expenditure incurred every year in the college?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" Notice."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" May I know whether the Hon. Minister is aware of the fact that at a students' meeting a resolution was passed requesting the Government to reduce the fees?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" I do not think any such representation has been received by the Government."

Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—" If the Hon. the Education Minister is opposed to the reduction of fees in the Law College, will there not be a fall in the strength of the students?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" We have got enough lawyers; no useful purpose is going to be served by unduly increasing their number."

Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar:—" May I ask if it is not the duty of the Government to see that the administration of the Law College should not be considered from the point of view of a commercial proposition but that only as much fee as they would require to be spent on the College should be levied and that they do not penalize legal education?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" They do not regard it as a commercial proposition. If the hon. Member will look at education as a whole, the Government are put out of pocket to a very large extent."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—" Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether it is the policy of the Government to reduce the number of Law Graduates year after year and whether they have any such scheme?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" That is not a matter with which I am concerned; probably the Hon. the Law Member will have to deal with such a question."

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" May I know if the Hon. Minister thinks that the increased fees has resulted in a reduced number of lawyers in the Presidency?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"To a small extent it has reduced the number; I would welcome a greater reduction."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether the Government are likely to recognize any private Law College provided it conforms to certain rules prescribed by the Government?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Such a proposal has not come in."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"Is it not a fact that the members of the staff are underpaid in the Law College in spite of the increase in the income of the College?"

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That question does not arise."

Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to transfer the College to the Bar Council?"

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"There is no such proposal before the Government."

Excise

Proposals for opening additional toddy and arrack shops during the ensuing year.

* 736 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many toddy and arrack shops existed in each district in each year for the past five years including 1935–36;

(*b*) how many new shops are proposed to be opened in each variety during the coming year in each district; and

(*c*) what the reasons are for the opening of these proposed new shops?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 95 answered on 3rd August 1934 and the answer to question No. 404 answered on 22nd January 1935, which give the information up to 1934–35. In 1935–36, the number of toddy and arrack shops sold was ten thousand one hundred and thirty-eight and five thousand seven hundred and one respectively. District-war particulars of toddy shops for 1935–36 are not available. A statement [a] is appended showing the number of arrack shops in each district for 1935–36.

(*b*) The Government have no information.

(*c*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 667.

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 620 infra.